REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are still pending in this application. Reconsideration of the application is earnestly requested.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9, 11 and 13-35 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by *Ji et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,943). Although the Examiner's arguments have been carefully considered, Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as explained below.

The Present Invention

The present invention is a system and method that identifies undesirable content sent from a target server to a user who has requested such content. In order to detect and identify such content from a target server before it arrives at a user's computer the present invention uses a redirection program that redirects the user's request to a separate proxy server that then communicates with the target server. Upon receipt of the response from the target server, the proxy server then scans the response for undesirable content such as spam, computer viruses or pornographic material. Thus, the proxy server is able to screen out such undesirable content because the user's original request of the target server has been redirected to a different computer.

As an example, Figure 2 illustrates a situation in which a network gateway computer 206 includes a redirection program 208 that causes a user's request to be redirected to a separate proxy server 218 instead of being directed to target server 220. Figure 5 shows an example of a target server address that has been redirected.

The Cited Art

Ji discloses a system for detecting and removing computer viruses from file transfers between computer networks and from electronic mail. Because operating a virus detection program on every computer within an enterprise can be impractical (column 2, line 43), *Ji* discloses a gateway computer node having a file transfer proxy server program and a mail transfer proxy server program that are used to detect and eliminate computer viruses before the file or message is transferred into a corporate network (column 3, lines 11-40). The file proxy

server 60 and the mail proxy server 62 are computer programs resident in the memory of the gateway computer 33 (see Figures 2 and 3).

Because all network traffic of *Ji* must pass through the gateway computer 33 by design, all user requests for content are addressed to some other outside target server. The user requests for content are not addressed to the gateway computer because they are passed through the gateway computer anyway. Figure 5A illustrates this situation. A client computer 30 is requesting content over the Internet from a server computer 30. The request passes through a gateway computer 33 that is part of the user's computer network; the gateway computer includes an FTP proxy server 60 that is arranged to detect computer viruses (column 6, lines 17-27). But, the request is not redirected to a different computer, the request and its corresponding response are necessarily processed by the FTP proxy server because the proxy server program is by design an additional layer between the application layer 406 and the presentation layer 405. Figure 4 illustrates that the proxy server program 421 is sandwiched between the file transfer layer 423 and the protocol layer 417. The FTP proxy server program processes outgoing requests and incoming responses not because a user request has been redirected to it, but because it has no choice, being an integral part of the file transfer protocol. (Column 7, lines 21-44).

Ji states at column 8, lines 23-25 that "the method begins with step 600 with the client node sending a connection request over the network to the gateway node 33." But, there is no indication or suggestion in this section or throughout *Ji* that the client connection request is modified or redirected in any manner. In fact, this entire paragraph simply indicates that the FTP proxy server handles the data transfer simply because it is inherently part of the file transfer mechanism. The client connection request was initially addressed to the outside server computer and remains addressed to the outside server computer throughout the entire process.

The Cited Art Distinguished

Claim 1 is a system for identifying undesirable content in responses and specifically requires "a proxy module that modifies the request for content to be redirected to a proxy server."

As discussed above, this redirection of the original request for content from the user is advantageous in that the redirected request will now pass through a proxy server that is arranged to screen out any undesirable content in the response. Respectfully, it is submitted that nowhere

in the disclosure of *Ji* is it taught or suggested that the original user request is modified or redirected in any manner. For example, column 8, lines 23-25 of *Ji* indicate that the client sends a connection request but this connection request is never modified or redirected. The Office Action at page 3 indicates that the required proxy module is disclosed at column 11, lines 35-41, but this portion of the specification simply discusses internal communications between the client task and the SMTP proxy server. An SMTP daemon is spawned, and a system call is redefined, but the original client connection request to a particular outside server is never modified or redirected. The client connection request will always end up at the outside server because the original address is not changed or redirected.

Because this required element of claim 1 is not taught or suggested by the art of record, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 16 is a method for identifying undesirable content in responses and specifically requires a step of "redirecting the request for content to a proxy server."

As discussed above, this redirection of the original request for content from the user is advantageous in that the redirected request will now pass through a proxy server that is arranged to screen out any undesirable content in the response. Respectfully, it is submitted that nowhere in the disclosure of *Ji* is it taught or suggested that the original user request is modified or redirected in any manner to a separate proxy server. For example, column 8, lines 23-25 of *Ji* indicate that the client sends a connection request but this connection request is never modified or redirected. The Office Action at page 6 indicates that the required proxy module is disclosed at column 11, lines 35-41, but this portion of the specification does not teach or suggest the required step as discussed immediately above.

Because this required element of claim 16 is not taught or suggested by the art of record, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 27 requires a computer readable medium that redirects a user request for content that is addressed to a target server, and specifically requires a step of "redirecting the request for content to a proxy server."

Respectfully, it is submitted that nowhere in the disclosure of *Ji* is it taught or suggested that the original user request for content is modified or redirected in any manner to a separate proxy server. The Office Action at page 3 indicates that the required proxy module is disclosed

at column 11, lines 35-41, but this portion of the specification does not teach or suggest the required step as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim Rejections

Claims 24 and 34 have been rejected in that the Office Action indicates that it is not clear which "request" is being modified. Respectfully, Applicant points out that the "request" of claim 24 refers to the "user request for content" first recited in claim 16. Also, the "request" of claim 34 refers to the "user request for content" first recited in claim 27. Applicant believes that the claims are clear as they stand, but is willing to amend claims 24 and 34 if the Examiner has a strong preference.

Reconsideration of this application and issuance of a Notice of Allowance at an early date are respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would in any way expedite prosecution, please do not hesitate to telephone the undersigned at (612) 252-3330.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS

Jonathan O. Scott
Registration No. 39,364

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778

Telephone: (612) 252-3330
Facsimile: (612) 825-6304